

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7-14, 16-28, 31-38, 40-62, and 54-102 are now pending in the application. Claims 5-6 and 29-30 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice to the subject matter contained therein. While Applicant disagrees with the current rejections, Applicant has amended the claims to expedite prosecution. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as originally filed in one or more continuing applications. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the drawings and specification. As such, no new matter is added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-14, 16-17, 20, 22-23, 25-28, 31, 33-34, 36-38, 40-41, 44, 46-47, 49-52, 55, 57-58, 60-62, 64-65, 67-68, 70-71, 73-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Bear et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0225901). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, Bear fails to show, teach, or suggest at least a secondary processor that is integrated with a wireless network interface and that processes wireless network data in each of active and inactive modes. In contrast, the alleged secondary processor of Bear appears to be entirely independent of the network interface and associated processing.

For anticipation to be present under 35 U.S.C §102(b), there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure as viewed by

one skilled in the field of the invention. Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. V. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991). All of the limitations of the claim must be inherent or expressly disclosed and must be arranged as in the claim. Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc., 7 USPQ.2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Here, Bear fails to disclose the limitation of **a secondary processor that is integrated with a wireless network interface and that processes wireless network data in each of active and inactive modes.**

As shown in an exemplary embodiment in FIG. 3A of the present application, a computer architecture 100-1 includes a low power secondary processor 102 associated with a secondary display 110. The secondary processor 102 and the secondary display 110 are powered up during an inactive mode. Conversely, a primary processor 20 and display 30 are powered down during the active mode. The secondary processor 102 is integrated with a wireless network interface 120 of the device. Accordingly, the secondary processor 102 provides functionality typically associated with an independent processor provided with the wireless network interface 120, as well as the processing related to the low power secondary devices in the inactive mode (e.g. display 110 and I/O devices 112; See Paragraph [0034]).

In contrast, Bear appears to be absent of any teaching or suggestion of this structure. For example, FIG. 2 discloses an auxiliary computing device 10 (which includes an alleged auxiliary processor 12) that is located external to primary computing device 20. Applicant respectfully notes that a network interface 53 is located within the computing device 20. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the auxiliary processor 12 is not integrated with the network interface 53. Similarly, FIG. 3 discloses

does not appear to disclose that the auxiliary processor 12 is integrated with the network interface 53. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Bear fails to show, teach, or suggest a secondary processor that is integrated with a wireless network interface.

Further, as best understood by Applicant, the network interface 53 provides communication and associated processing between the primary computing device 20 and a wireless network (See Paragraph [0038]). As such, Applicant respectfully notes that the network interface 53 provides processing of wireless network data during alleged active modes of the device. Accordingly, Bear appears to be absent of any teaching or suggestion that the auxiliary processor 12 processes wireless network data in active and inactive modes.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the above reasons. Claims 12, 25, 36, 49, and 60, as well as their corresponding dependent claims, should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 27, 2008

By: 
Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754

Damian M. Aquino
Reg. No. 54,964

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDW/DMA/dms